



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/454,348

12/03/1999

YASSER ALSAFADI

PHA-23.863

3612

24737

7590

01/24/2005

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

YUAN, ALMARI ROMERO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/454,348	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ALSAFADI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Almari Yuan	<b>Art Unit</b> 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 8/10/04.
2. The rejection of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
3. Claims 24-29 are newly added. Claims 1-29 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, 15, 18 and 27-29 are independent claims.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1, 6, 11, 13-14 and 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Meltzer et al. (USPN 6,226,675 B1 – filed 10/1998).**

**Regarding independent claims 1, 27, and 29, Meltzer discloses:**

A method of operating an intelligent digital device (IDD) receiving an eXtensible Markup Language (XML) document containing data and respective Document Type Definition (DTD) describing the data content, comprising:

verifying that a received DTD satisfies a predetermined criterion; and if said criterion is satisfied, operating on said data based on said content (Meltzer on col. 23, lines 38-46 teaches

Art Unit: 2176

receiving and processing incoming document such as XML; wherein the parser identifies the document type (DTD) of the document; the document is parsed to identify elements and attributes of the document for the translation into the format accepted by the host).

**Regarding independent claims 6, 28, and (dependent claims 11 and 13-14), Meltzer discloses:**

A method of operating a system including a digital network interconnected intelligent digital devices (IDDs) generating and receiving eXtensible Markup Language (XML) documents containing data and respective Document Type Definitions (DTDs) describing the data content , comprising:

transmitting a generated XML document from a first IDD to a second IDD (Meltzer on col. 80, lines 45-54 teaches XML documents are transferred between businesses and processed by participant nodes (also see col. 9, lines 10-28 teaches nodes)); and

the respective DTD for the generated XML document, operating on said data contained in the XML document at the second IDD based on said content (Meltzer on col. 23, lines 38-46 teaches receiving and processing incoming document such as XML; wherein the parser identifies the document type (DTD) of the document; the document is parsed to identify elements and attributes of the document for the translation into the format accepted by the host).

**Regarding dependent claim 24,** Meltzer discloses wherein said received DTD is contained along with said data in said XML upon reception of said DTD that is to be subject to said verifying (on col. 23, lines 38-46 teaches the XML document contains a stored DTD and is received to be identified by the parser).

Art Unit: 2176

**Regarding dependent claim 25**, Meltzer discloses wherein said verifying is performed in response to said reception (on col. 38-46 teaches parser for identifying the DTD from the received document).

**Regarding dependent claim 26**, Meltzer discloses receiving the transmitted generated XML document; determining, upon reception of said transmitted, generated XML document, whether said criterion is satisfied; and if said determining determines that said criterion is satisfied, performing said operating (on col. 3, lines 28-34 teaches the receiving data comprising a document through a communication network).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 2-5, 7-10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meltzer, as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, in view of Cheng et al. (USPN 6,519,597 B1 – filed 06/1999).**

**Regarding dependent claims 2, 7, and 12**, Meltzer discloses the invention substantially as claimed as described above. However, Meltzer does not explicitly disclose “wherein the predetermined criterion is equality between the name of the received DTD and the name of a trusted DTD”.

Art Unit: 2176

Cheng does disclose “wherein the predetermined criterion is equality between the name of the received DTD and the name of a trusted DTD” on col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 9, lines 44-61, col. 13, lines 37-58, and col. 17, lines 29-45 teaches XML document has a DTD to be mapped to a table of DTDs).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Cheng into Meltzer to provide a way to determine if the DTD of a XML document is in a table of DTDs, as taught by Cheng, incorporated into the exchanging of XML documents, as taught by Meltzer, in order to clearly understand document structures and allow user to store, search, and retrieve XML documents.

**Regarding dependent claims 3 and 8,** Cheng discloses:

wherein the predetermined criterion comprises the inclusion of the name of a program residing on the IDD (Cheng on col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 9, lines 44-61, col. 13, lines 37-58, and col. 17, lines 29-45: teaches XML extender provides functions for storage, search, and retrieval of XML documents).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Cheng into Meltzer to provide a way to determine if the DTD of a XML document is in a table of DTDs, as taught by Cheng, incorporated into the exchanging of XML documents, as taught by Meltzer, in order to clearly understand document structures and allow user to store, search, and retrieve XML documents.

**Regarding dependent claims 4 and 9,** Meltzer discloses:

wherein the program comprises an XML-enabled program (Meltzer on col. 29, line 16 teaches XML applications).

Art Unit: 2176

**Regarding dependent claim 5, Meltzer discloses:**

wherein the program comprises an XML parser (Meltzer on col. 24, lines 27-28 teaches XML parser).

**Regarding dependent claim 10, Meltzer discloses:**

wherein the program comprises an XML processor (Meltzer on col. 79, line 40 teaches XML processor).

8. **Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meltzer in view of Humpleman (International Publication No. WO99/57837 – published 11/1999).**

**Regarding independent claim 15, Meltzer discloses:**

A method of operating a system including a digital network interconnected intelligent digital devices (IDDs) generating and receiving eXtensible Markup Language (XML) documents containing data and respective Document Type Definitions (DTDs) describing the data content, comprising:

(a) generating an XML document containing related data and a reference to a respective DTD at a first IDD (Meltzer on col. 26, lines 11-12 teaches a taking an XML document and applying it to a parser/generator); (b) transmitting the XML document from the first to the second IDD (Meltzer on col. 80, lines 45-54 teaches XML documents are transferred between businesses and processed by participant nodes (also see col. 9, lines 10-28 teaches nodes);

(c) parsing the data in the XML document in accordance with the format described in the respective DTD to thereby generate parsed data from the related data; and (d) operating on the parsed data (Meltzer on col. 23, lines 38-46 teaches receiving and processing incoming

Art Unit: 2176

document such as XML; wherein the parser identifies the document type (DTD) of the document; the document is parsed to identify elements and attributes of the document for the translation into the format accepted by the host).

However, Meltzer does not explicitly disclose “responsive to a command from a second IDD”.

Humpleman on page 17, lines 11-21, page 19, lines 17-29, and page 30, lines 6-14: teaches device-device control using command languages in XML is used for validity check to the XML interface of the device.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Humpleman into Meltzer to provide command languages in XML for device to device control, as taught by Humpleman, incorporated into the network environment of Meltzer, in order increase the capabilities of communication between network devices.

**9. Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meltzer and Humpleman, as applied to claim 15 above, in view of Cheng et al. (USPN 6,519,597 B1 – filed 06/1999).**

**Regarding dependent claims 16 and 17,** Meltzer and Humpleman discloses the invention substantially as described above. However, Meltzer and Humpleman do not disclose “the second IDD stores a list of trusted DTDs associated with respective XML processors; the predetermined criterion is coincidence between the respective DTD and a trusted DTD on the list”.



Art Unit: 2176

Cheng on col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 9, lines 44-61, col. 13, lines 37-58, and col. 17, lines 29-45: teaches managing XML documents between extranets (between businesses) and determining if a XML document has DTD to be mapped to a table of stored DTDs and if DTD is not known the DTD is stored in the table.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Cheng into Meltzer and Humpleman to provide a way to determine if the DTD of a XML document is in a table of DTDs, as taught by Cheng, incorporated into the exchanging of XML documents, as taught by Meltzer and Humpleman, in order to clearly understand document structures and allow user to store, search, and retrieve XML documents.

**10. Claims 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meltzer in view of Humpleman and in further view of Cheng.**

**Regarding independent claim 18 and (dependent claim 19-23), Meltzer discloses:**

A system comprising: a plurality of intelligent digital devices (IDDs) interconnected to one another, each of the IDD's being capable of one of generating and receiving an eXtensible Markup Language (XML) document containing data and referencing, a document type definition (DTD); wherein:

IDDs stores XML processors associated with named DTDs (Meltzer on col. 80, lines 45-54 teaches XML documents are transferred between businesses and processed by participant nodes based on XML processors (also see col. 9, lines 10-28 teaches types of nodes)); and

the respective DTD for the generated XML document (Meltzer on col. 23, lines 38-46 teaches receiving and processing incoming document such as XML; wherein the parser identifies the document type (DTD) of the document; the document is parsed to identify elements and attributes of the document for the translation into the format accepted by the host).

However, Meltzer does not explicitly disclose “a first IDD generates the XML document responsive to a command received over the an in-house digital network (IHDN)”.

Humpleman on page 6, lines 1-8, page 29, lines 26-32, and page 30, lines 6-14: teaches exchanging XML commands or messages between a network of devices for the controlling of home devices.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Humpleman into Meltzer to provide command languages in XML for device to device control, as taught by Humpleman, incorporated into the network environment of Meltzer, in order increase the capabilities of communication between network devices.

However, Meltzer and Humpleman do not explicitly disclose “when the respective DTD corresponds to one of the named DTDs”.

Cheng on col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 9, lines 44-61, col. 13, lines 37-58, and col. 17, lines 29-45: teaches managing XML documents between extranets (between businesses); XML extender for searching the table of stored DTDs; XML parser parses the XML document to determine if the DTD is inserted in the table of DTDs and if DTD is not known the DTD is stored in the table).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Cheng into Meltzer and Humpleman to provide a way to determine if the DTD of a XML document is inserted in the table of DTDs by using the XML extender and XML parser, as taught by Cheng, incorporated into the exchanging of XML documents, as taught by Meltzer and Humpleman, in order to clearly understand document structures and allow user to store, search, and retrieve XML documents.

***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments filed 8/10/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's remarks on pages 8-9 and 11:

Applicant argues that Meltzer fails to disclose "verifying that a received DTD satisfies a predetermined criterion".

Meltzer does disclose "verifying that a received DTD satisfies a predetermined criterion, if said criterion is satisfied, operating on said data based on said content", on col. 23, lines 38-46 teaches a parser identifies the document type (DTD) of the received document; the document is parsed to identify elements and attributes of the document for the translation into the format accepted by the host, in other words, the parser identifies the document type of the document to perform the translation process on the data contained within the document. Furthermore, Meltzer on col. 10, lines 29-41 teaches the XML DTD is an example of a system based on parsed data that includes mark-up data and character data.

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding Applicant's remarks on page 10:

Applicant argues that Cheng does not disclose "operating on an XML document contingent upon whether the DTD was already in the table" and does not disclose "verification that a received DTD satisfies a predetermined criterion".

Cheng discloses "wherein the predetermined criterion is equality between the name of the received DTD and the name of a trusted DTD" on col. 2, lines 1-7, col. 9, lines 44-61, col. 13, lines 37-58, and col. 17, lines 29-45 teaches XML document has a DTD to be mapped to a table of DTDs. Furthermore, Cheng on col. 13, line 54 and col. 11, lines 58-65 teaches DTD data is stored into the XML\_DTD\_REF table and on col. 9, lines 54-60 teaches the parser parses the XML document to determine if it contains a DTD; the XML extender searches the XML\_DTD\_REF table to check if the DTD is stored, if not the extender inserts the new DTD.

### ***Conclusion***

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2176

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Almari Yuan whose telephone number is 571-272-4104. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays - Fridays (8:30am - 5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AY  
January 18, 2005

  
JOSEPH FEILD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER